

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,304	11/08/2001	Timothy Ringeisen	KN P 0020	5717
42016 KENSEY NAS	7590 11/16/2009 SH CORPORATION	EXAMINER		
735 PENNSYI	LVANIA DRIVE	SILVERMAN, ERIC E		
EXTON, PA 1	9341		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/010,304	RINGEISEN, TIMOTHY		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ERIC E. SILVERMAN	1618		

	ERIC E. SILVERMAN	1618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 operiods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	g date of the final rejection.		
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailling date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.	21 See attached Nation of Non Co	mpliant Amandment (OTOL 224)
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		Impliant Amendment (- I OL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,	•	
7. M For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	planation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>0-6,70,26,33-47 and 33-36</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Eric E Silverman/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1618	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendments have been entered. The arguments are not persuasive. With respect to claim 6, there are anultitude of siloxane-based macrodiol, aromatic polyurethanes having different structures. For example, a siloxane based macrodiol amoratic polyurethane may be linear or branched, ionic or non-ionic, and may have one or more of variety of aromatic groups (styryl, napthyl, benzyl, phenyl, acridinyl, furanyl, etc.). Also, the molecular weight of siloxane-based macrodiol aromatic polyurethanes may vary from a few hundred to several million dailons. The single example of the specification (which does not diacted any specific structure) does not appear to be fully representative of such variety in structure and molecular weight. Nor have applicants given any technical reasoning that would indicate that it is representative of all siloxane-based macrodiol aromatic polyurethanes.

Applicants lump the remaining claims together with claim 6, in what seems to be an attempt to distract the office from the fact that no claim other than claim 6 is limited to a siloxane-based macrodiol. None of applicants arguments apply to any of these other claims. As applicants have not provided any reason as to why the claims that are not limited to siloxane-based macrodiol aromatic polyurethanes are free of the rejection; the rejection therefore must be maintained over these claims.